	Case 2:01-cv-00507-MCE-DB Documer	nt 543 Filed 06/12/14 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10		
11	CHARLES D. RIEL,	No. 2:01-cv-0507 LKK DAD
12	Petitioner,	DEATH PENALTY CASE
13	v.	
14	WARDEN, San Quentin State Prison,	<u>ORDER</u>
15	Respondent.	
16		
17	In 2009, the assigned district judge granted in part and denied in part petitioner's motion	
18	for an evidentiary hearing in this action. (ECF No. 212.) Specifically, the assigned district judge	
19	adopted the then-assigned magistrate judge's reasoning in her ruling on the motion for an	
20	evidentiary hearing in all but one respect. (<u>Id.</u>) The district judge held that the magistrate judge	
21	failed to properly consider the standards for application of California's felony-murder rule to a	
22	nonkiller in declining to hold an evidentiary hearing on petitioner's claim of ineffective assistance	
23	of counsel at the guilt phase and, therefore, did not adopt the recommendation in that respect. (<u>Id.</u>	
24	at 3-7.)	
25	It does not appear that either party mentions these felony-murder rule standards, or the	
26	district judge's application of them to petitioner's case, in the briefing on the application of 28	
27	U.S.C. § 2254(d) to this action. Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED as follows:	
28	///// 1	
		1

Case 2:01-cv-00507-MCE-DB Document 543 Filed 06/12/14 Page 2 of 2

- 1. Within twenty days of the filed date of this order, petitioner shall file a memorandum of points and authorities explaining whether the rationales for the assigned district judge's holding that petitioner had sufficiently shown guilt phase prejudice stemming from the ineffective assistance of counsel, discussed at pages 3 through 7 of the court's March 27, 2009 Order, were raised in the state court. If those issues were raised in state court, petitioner shall explain whether he addressed them in his § 2254(d) briefing or explain why he did not address them. If the issues were not raised in state court, petitioner shall explain whether the issues may be considered by this court in determining whether petitioner has satisfied the § 2254(d) standards.
- 2. Within twenty days after petitioner has filed his memorandum, respondent shall file a responsive memorandum.
- 3. Within ten days thereafter, petitioner may file a reply.

Dated: June 10, 2014

Dad1.capital riel 2254d supp brfing.or

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE